

December 2, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10547

mentioned, was last year with the bill before us passing out of the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, though not receiving action by the other body.

H.R. 2704 addresses several concerns that I have. In particular, it supports the requirement that those agencies commenting on the fish and wildlife impacts of Federal projects must report to Congress on their review responsibilities and include an evaluation of the results and effectiveness of compliance with the conditions which they recommend.

I also believe that the authority given to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to cooperate in the preparation of long-term plans for large-scale projects will provide for the protection of fish and wildlife resources, and, at the same time, will give assurances to the permit applicants of the manner in which their future permits will be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H.R. 2704.

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2704 would make a number of important and constructive changes in one of our oldest and most important conservation statutes, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, first enacted by Congress in 1934, was one of the earliest Federal environmental statutes and represented the first attempt to integrate fish and wildlife conservation measures into the Federal Government's water resources planning activities. As amended in 1946, the act requires Federal agencies that administer projects modifying water resources to take fish and wildlife resources into consideration before proceeding.

The legislation before us today attempts to deal with some relatively technical issues that have been called to our attention in the implementation of the Coordination Act. First, it authorizes off-site as well as on-site mitigation to facilitate comprehensive planning for projects and allows for innovative conflict resolution mechanisms such as mitigation banking. Second, it requires, rather than simply authorizes, the agencies responsible for Federal projects to provide funds to the Federal fish and wildlife agencies to carry out their studies. Third, it calls for a study to determine whether or not permit conditions requested by the fish and wildlife agencies are effective and if they are being complied with.

Finally, this legislation adds a new section to the act which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce to cooperate in the development of plans for areas such as port development projects and to enter into contractual agreements to provide assurances that fish and wildlife resources are protected. The project sponsors would in turn receive assurances that their future permit processing would be carried out under the conditions or guidelines set forth in the agreement.

This legislation is noncontroversial. Virtually identical legislation was passed by

the House in 1984 but was not considered by the other body. I urge my fellow Members to give it their support.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2704, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2704, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO OPPOSES CENTRAL AMERICAN COUNTER-TERRORISM ACT (H.R. 3463)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Americans have been justifiably outraged by the recent escalation in terrorist attacks against our citizens around the world. There are some in the present administration who would use this as a pretext for perpetrating another outrage. I believe that certain provisions of the Central American Counter-Terrorism Act are a blatant attempt to increase U.S. control over Central American nations; and that, if this legislation should pass, it will result in intensified violence to innocent civilians, thus accomplishing the very opposite of what it intends.

In short we are proposing to send to Central America an additional \$54 million, half of which—\$27 million to be used to increase the capability of the armed forces and half (\$26 million) to be used for counterterrorism training. Three countries will receive \$38 million, over half of which will be used for counter terrorism training and strengthening the police and security forces. The only problem is that in those three countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—the police and security forces are often the source of terror. We are giving the fox the keys to the chicken coop—and better chicken wire for trapping the prey.

Indeed there are some battles, some threats and some enemies that can only be overcome with force. But who is the enemy in El Salvador? With whom are the armed

forces of El Salvador at war? Who are the victims of the increased supply of bombs, airships, weapons, and instruments of incarceration? The answer is the people of El Salvador.

For most Salvadorans today there are two facts of life: desperate poverty, and the war. For the people of El Salvador the war threatens them on two fronts: the air war and bombardment which United States support makes possible, and the police surveillance which we now propose to escalate. Every helicopter we send to El Salvador is a potential gunship. Thousands of peasants are living in underground holes during the daylight hours in order to escape the bombing. At night they have to hide from the army patrols and the security forces. We have doubled the capacity of the Salvadoran air force; in the past year there has been a dramatic increase in tonnage and weight of bombs, and ammunition expended in the air war. We know that perhaps as much as a third of the Salvadoran population has been dislocated by the war. Hunger, disease, and broken families are what our policy has guaranteed for thousands of Salvadorans.

This massive aid package will bring increased status and legitimization to some of the most despicable police hoodlums in our hemisphere, and it will give the security forces increased arbitrary control over the population through training techniques and communication equipment for interrogation and surveillance—no doubt to be used to keep track of anyone who might threaten the status quo. Ironically this program has been called the Public Safety Program. Pat Holt, for many years a respected aide to Senator Fulbright, and the author of a study of the Public Safety Programs of the seventies, similar to the one proposed for funding in El Salvador, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that given the nature of the military and police structures already in place, it would be foolish to expect anything different from the dismal record of previous programs. Such programs have been total failures in the past, and a civilian President is not going to make any difference.

I registered a personal protest about the air war and other human rights abuses in El Salvador with President Duarte during his recent visit to Capitol Hill. I asked him to send me an explanation for this continued victimization of the civilian population. I have not yet received an answer. And on this floor today I want to register my protest with our own Government and every Member of this body who is responsible for our most important exports to El Salvador—death, homelessness, and hunger.

One country has received over two-thirds of all military assistance we sent to Latin America—El Salvador. Are we going to continue to entrust this level of force—the power of life and death over the Salvadoran people—to those whose behavior we cannot guarantee, much less monitor? Reliance on might to make right in this situation is a foolish and self-defeating enterprise. It is also immoral. The harvest we reap will be measured in innocent lives, in growing anti-Americanism, and in a stale-

H 10548

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 2, 1985

mate that lines the pockets of the rich and the military.

Surely this is a demonstration, not of our national strength, but of our weakness. The Reagan policy is cynical and without hope, a testimony to the failure of our diplomacy.

We cannot fight terrorism by exporting terror.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3833, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CITIES AND TOWNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BONER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the introduction today of H.R. 3833, a bill to convene a national conference on cities and towns.

The need for a national conference has never been greater than it is today. As the President and Congress take steps to reduce the Federal budget deficit, the relationship between the Federal Government and cities and towns has been obscured. In fact, in many instances, this important relationship has not been adequately considered during deficit cutting deliberations.

Federalism, the relationship between cities, towns, and the Federal Government, is a linchpin of our constitutional system. In the 19th century, the Frenchman Alexis de Toqueville, lavished praise on American federalism in his book "Democracy in America." In the link between self-government and liberty, he commented "a nation may establish a free government, but without municipal institutions it cannot have the spirit of liberty."

The spirit of liberty. That essential element of self-government that is often elusive and difficult to sustain. As the form of government closest to the sentiments of its citizens, cities and towns have played the major role in fostering the spirit of liberty and in creating this Nation's great wealth and talent. Cities and towns have been the center of commerce, the center of culture, and the center of finance. During our Nation's history, cities and towns represented to many Americans the focal point for taking advantage of opportunity, and for improving the quality of their lives and those of their family.

Central to the thinking of our Nation's founders was developing a governing system to foster a link between these geographically dispersed cities and towns and the Nation as a whole. Simultaneously, our founders debated the issue of giving the Central Government sufficient authority while protecting individual liberties and local self-government.

Certainly our forefathers could not anticipate the complexity and difficulty of many of the issues that the National Government and local governments face. But,

our forefathers laid out principals that, when followed, can assure the continued vitality of cities and towns and the relationship with the Federal Government. On the whole, the relationship that has developed over nearly 200 years has enabled cities and towns to grow, prosper, and perform an important role in our system of self-government.

That relationship has always been challenged by the changes dictated by the issues of the day. This is especially true today. As Congress and the President evaluate the role the Federal Government will perform between now and the 21st century, the important role of cities and towns cannot be overlooked. In fact, as the Federal Government begins a retreat from its earlier role, it is not surprising that cities and towns will be expected to pick up many of those responsibilities.

The trend toward shifting responsibilities to cities and towns has already begun. Several important federally mandated activities have been imposed on cities and towns. Most of these have been in the form of compliance requirements with Federal laws, particularly Federal environmental laws.

At the same time, the Federal financial resources necessary to help cities and towns comply with many of these requirements have been reduced significantly. Federal funds for housing and community development programs administered by cities and towns have been reduced from some 40 billions of dollars in fiscal year 1979 to only about \$10 billion in fiscal year 1986.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURES

(In millions of dollars)

	Direct Federal assistance	Tax expenditures
Fiscal year:		
1979.....	40,973	38,125
1984.....	21,690	65,970
1986.....	19,315	72,285

Source: National League of Cities.

General revenue sharing, a program initiated during the Nixon administration to share Federal revenues with local government, has been cut this year to less than \$3½ billion from a peak of nearly \$7 billion in the late 1970's. According to figures calculated by the Tennessee Municipal League, cities and towns in Tennessee will, on average, have to increase taxes 9.4 percent to make up for the loss of general revenue sharing funds following the expiration of the program in 1987.

General revenue sharing appropriations, fiscal years 1973-86

(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year:	Amount
1973.....	6.636
1974.....	6.105
1975.....	6.129
1976.....	6.242
TQ.....	1.587
1977.....	6.757
1978.....	6.823
1979.....	6.847
1980.....	6.828
1981.....	5.136
1982.....	4.568
1983.....	4.614
1984.....	4.566

1985..... 4.874
1986..... 3.425

Source: OMB Historical Tables—budget of the U.S. Government—fiscal year 1986 and House Committee on Appropriations.

DISTRIBUTION AND IMPACT OF REVENUE SHARING—STATE OF TENNESSEE

(Fifteenth Entitlement Period—Oct. 1, 1983, to Sept. 30, 1984)

	Current GRS allocation	Percent
U.S. Representative:		
James Gillen.....	\$7,625,891	10.4
John Duncan.....	9,458,085	9.0
Marlyn Lloyd.....	9,121,226	9.2
James Cooper.....	7,013,679	14.5
Bill Boner.....	10,831,367	7.1
Bart Gordon.....	6,486,427	10.4
Don Studds.....	8,552,582	10.3
Ed Jones.....	8,552,434	11.9
Harold Ford.....	14,438,532	8.2
State totals.....	83,026,617	9.4

¹ Average tax increases needed to replace GRS funds.
Source: Tennessee Municipal League.

Similar spending reduction patterns are clear for transit assistance, job training, sewer and water quality, economic development programs, elder Americans assistance programs, and many other programs benefiting the citizens of both cities and towns.

In addition to direct Federal spending, the topic of Federal tax policy is of far-reaching importance to the citizens of our Nation's cities and towns. In particular, the growth of several specific tax expenditures demonstrates their use by cities and towns to replace declining levels of direct Federal assistance, particularly in housing and community development programs.

These tax expenditures include small issue industrial development bonds; State and local industrial development bonds for the construction of public facilities; the investment tax credit for the rehabilitation of commercial and industrial nonhistoric buildings; and the investment tax credit for the rehabilitation of historic buildings.

Similarly, the targeted jobs tax credit, which is available for private employers, mortgage revenue bonds, the home mortgage interest tax deduction, and the Federal deduction for local and State taxes all have an important, albeit a less obvious, impact on the continued vitality of our Nation's cities and towns.

These tax expenditures are currently receiving intensive scrutiny by the House and Senate tax-writing committees. They are being evaluated, however, from the perspective of how much revenue they cost the Federal Treasury. Equally important, however, is the question of what effect their elimination will have on the ability of our cities and towns to govern and meet the needs of their citizens.

These are only a few examples of some of the issues affecting the relationship between cities and towns and the Federal Government. To say that they are being studied less than comprehensively is an understatement.

Nonetheless, there are challenges, many foreseeable, that cities and towns will face in the next 15 years to the 21st century. The value of a National Conference on Cities and Towns is that these challenges will be studied and debated by local officials and policy experts, with recommenda-